

## AMENDMENTS TO THE FIGURES

Submitted herewith are replacement Figures 1, 3A and 3B. Figures 1, 3A and 3B are amended to include labels for the unlabelled elements in the figures. Specifically, each of the unlabelled elements is labeled as a “node.” Also, in Figure 1, the nodes 2, 3, 6 and 7 are identified as an “ad hoc network.”

Attachment: Replacement Figures 1, 3A and 3B

## REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 8 and 16 are amended herein.  
No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

### Drawings

Figures 1, 3A and 3B are amended to address the objection raised in the instant Office Action.

### 112 Rejections

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1, 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 8 and 16 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

### 102 Rejections

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16-17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Carr (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,617). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16-17 and 19-22 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Carr.

According to embodiments of the present claimed invention, a sought-for item of information is either sent to a requesting device or sent to an address (where it can be accessed by the requesting device). In general, according to embodiments of the present invention, the sought-for item of information is moved, either to the requesting device or to a location identified by the requesting device.

Carr describes a method and apparatus in which, for example, a sought-for file is located using a virtual Uniform Resource Locator (URL) that is resolved into a reference to the actual physical location of the sought-for file. In contrast to the present claimed invention, the file is not moved to a specified location from which it is accessed; instead, the file remains in its location and a request for that file is resolved to that location.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Carr does not show or suggest the present claimed invention. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Carr does not show or suggest “creating a message that identifies said item of information and that also identifies an address, said message readable by a second wireless device within communication range; ... wherein ... said message is propagated by said second wireless device to other wireless devices, wherein in response to said message any of said other wireless devices having said item of information and a connection to said address sends said item of information to said address” as recited in independent Claim 1.

Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Carr does not show or suggest “receiving from a second wireless device an address and content associated with said information item; and propagating a message to other wireless devices within communication range, ... wherein in response to said message any of said other wireless devices having said item of information and a connection to said address sends said item of information to said address” as recited in independent Claim 8.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Carr does not show or suggest “receiving from a second wireless device an address and content

associated with said information item; ... propagating a message to other wireless devices within communication range, ... wherein in response to said message any of said other wireless devices having said information item and a connection to said address sends said information item to said address” as recited in independent Claim 16.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Carr does not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting independent Claims 1, 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and that these claims are in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11-14, 17 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is also traversed, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and contain additional limitations.

### 103 Rejections

#### Claims 6, 15 and 23

The instant Office Action states that Claims 6, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Malkin et al. (“Malkin,” U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014269). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 6, 15 and 23 are not shown or suggested by Carr and Malkin, alone or in combination.

Claims 6, 15 and 23 are dependent on independent Claim 1, 8 or 16 and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that Carr and Malkin (alone or in combination) do not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1, 8 and 16, it is also demonstrated that Carr and Malkin (alone or in combination) do not show

or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 6, 15 and 23.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Carr does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 16. Applicants further submit that Malkin does not overcome the shortcomings of Carr. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Malkin, alone or in combination with Carr, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 8 and 16 cited above. Accordingly, because Claims 6, 15 and 23 depend from either Claim 1, 8 or 16 and contain additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 6, 15 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed, and Claims 6, 15 and 23 are in condition for allowance.

#### Claims 10 and 18

The instant Office Action states that Claims 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr. The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 10 and 18 are not shown or suggested by Carr.

Claims 10 and 18 are dependent on independent Claim 8 or 16 and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that Carr does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 8 and 16, it is also demonstrated that Carr does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 10 and 18.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Carr does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in

independent Claims 8 and 16. Accordingly, because Claims 10 and 18 depend from either Claim 8 or 16 and contain additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed, and Claims 10 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-23 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.


Applicants have reviewed the reference cited but not relied upon. Applicants did not find this reference to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent No. 6,598,048.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 9/22/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060

100110473-1  
Serial No.: 10/051,857

Examiner: CHOW, M.  
Art Unit: 2645